

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated February 28, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, Applicant amends claim 1 and cancels claim 11 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 6,8, 16 and 21-28 are withdrawn as the result of an earlier restriction requirement. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 12-29 are pending in the present application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 1 and claim 29 are objected to because of minor typographical errors. Applicant respectfully submits that this objection is now believed to be moot in view of the current amendments.

In addition, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,729) in view of Liu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,573,965) and Von Gutfeld et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,035); claims 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Kishimoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,718); claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Tanaka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,528); claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,953).

The rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al. and Von Gutfeld et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "...wherein the second height of the sealant structure is higher than the first height of the dielectric frame, and a height difference between the first height and the second height is more than 1µm."

On page 12 of the Office Action, in rejecting claim 11, the Examiner admits that Oh et al., Liu et al. and Von Gutfeld et al. fail to teach the aforementioned features in claim 1. The Examiner then cites Kishimoto et al. to cure the deficient teachings of Oh et al., Liu et al. and

Von Gutfeld et al., stating that Kishimoto et al. “discloses the motivation to optimize the height of a dielectric structure is to account for the relative dielectric constants of the respective components (col. 18, lines 21-23).”

Applicant respectfully submits that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the prior art references when combined must at least teach or suggest all the claim elements. None of the cited references including Kishimoto et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggests the aforementioned features recited in claim 1. Assuming *arguendo* that Kishimoto et al. may teach a method for optimizing the height of a dielectric structure, it does not disclose or suggest the height relationship between the sealant structure and the dielectric frame in an LCD device. In the present application, a height difference between the sealant structure and the dielectric frame is more than 1µm to minimize or prevent, for example, bubbles generated in the liquid crystal of the LCD device. See TABLE 1 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12-14 and 29, which depend therefrom, are allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 11 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Kishimoto et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 11 is now moot because of the cancellation of claim 11, and that claim 20 is allowable because Kishimoto et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Oh et al., Liu et al. and Von Gutfeld et al., as discussed with respect to claim 1.

The rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Tanaka et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Tanaka et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Oh et al., Liu et al. and Von Gutfeld et al., claim 15 is allowable over the cited references.

The rejection of claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh et al. in view of Liu et al., Von Gutfeld et al. and Kim et al. is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Because Kim et al. fails to cure the deficient teaching of Oh et al., Liu et al. and Von Gutfeld et al., claims 17-19 are allowable over the cited references.


Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in

condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: May 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Rebecca G. Rudich
Registration No.: 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant